DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 855 SP 029 281

AUTHOR Simmons, Joanne M.
TITLE An Exploration of the Role Perspectives and Evaluative Judgment Criteria of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors.
PUB DATE Dec 86
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Evaluation; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Background; *Teacher Supervision; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

Cognitive mapping and interview techniques were used to: (1) examine the professional backgrounds of three university supervisors and their beliefs concerning the purposes of student teaching and supervision; (2) identify the supervisors' criteria in their cognitive maps of effective student teacher performance; and (3) continue developing and testing this research methodology for identifying, weighing, and analyzing these judgment criteria in a supervisor's cognitive map and their use in actual practice. Supervisors in this study included a novice with 11 years of elementary classroom teaching experience and a master's degree, while another had 5 years experience as a supervisor with 10 years of classroom teaching experience and training in supervision and teacher preparation/staff development, and the third had 3 years of supervisory experience with 20 years classroom teaching experience and a doctorate in reading/language arts. Results indicated that degree of satisfaction with the position, desire to continue in the position, and degree of comfort varied with experience, education, and personal attributes. All three supervisors were able to identify and weigh the evaluative criteria they used in supervising student teachers, but the actual criteria varied widely among the supervisors. It is concluded that data obtained from this study presents only the beginning of many aspects of much-needed research in this area. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285855

AN EXPLORATION OF THE ROLE PERSPECTIVES & EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA OF THREE UNIVERSITY STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS

December 1986

Joanne M. Simmons, Ph.D.

Department of Teacher Education
Associate Professor
Michigan State University
Department of Teacher Education

Office: 210 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 353-6418
Home: (616) 957-4189

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Simmons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Author's Background

Simmons is an Associate Professor in Michigan State University's Department of Teacher Education and MSU's Grand Rapids Teacher Education Center. She has taught graduate courses in clinical supervision and been a student teacher supervisor for eight years. She is a member of the Supervisory Judgment Research (SJR) Project team at MSU together with Roger C. Niemeyer and R. Arden Moon.

SP029281

An Exploration of the Role Perspectives and Evaluative Judgment Criteria of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors

Abstract: Cognitive mapping techniques and interviewing have been used to reveal the contrasting role perspectives and evaluative judgment criteria used by three university student teacher supervisors with different professional backgrounds. The implications of these findings for future research and for the selection, training, and on-going support of such supervisors are presented.

Outline:

1 - introduction
2 - origin & focus of this investigation
3 - alternative views of the student teaching experience & its supervision
4 - who are university student teaching supervisors & what do they typically do?
5 - profiles of the three university supervisors studied
6 - data collection procedures
7 - investigation results regarding supervisory role perspectives
8 - investigation results regarding the identification of evaluative judgment criteria
9 - conclusions & further questions

An Exploration of the Role Perspectives & Evaluative Judgment Criteria of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors (12/86)

Despite continuing controversy about the purposes and actual outcomes of the student teaching experience, it and the role of the university supervisor are generally universal components of teacher preparation programs in one form or another today. A review of literature on the student teaching experience reveals that a rather unquestioned earlier emphasis on (a) instructional skills evaluation and on (b) socialization of the prospective teacher as the twin foci of student teaching supervision has given way to the acknowledged existence of alternative paradigms today.

These alternative orientations to the desired purposes and outcomes of the student teaching experience provide a conceptual basis for investigating the complex mixture of role perspectives and the evaluative judgment criteria and practices which are found in actual student teacher supervision by university faculty today (1). The related questions of the characteristics, selection, preparation, and professional development of university student teacher supervisors will also be discussed here.

More specifically, we recognize today that central to all of the on-going interaction among members of the student teaching supervision triad are each person's expectations or "mental pictures" of the desired criteria, their meaning, and their relative weights which the person believes would characterize a so-called competent and successful student teacher's overall performance. Such different conceptual maps, one can argue, express and give focus to the goals, questions, explanations, tasks, observations, informal conversations, feedback conferences, seminars, evaluation reports, and feelings of satisfaction or dissonance for each member of the student teaching triad.

While this can be considered from each person's perspective in the supervision triad, the focus here will be on that of the university supervisor.

Furthermore, given what we are coming to know today concerning the complexities of information processing psychology and of judgmental decision-making processes for teachers (2) and other professionals (3), it is possible to raise these same questions about the knowledge, beliefs, and judgment criteria of supervisors. Of course, there are many more questions than answers available at this time in this area. In this case, these questions include what these judgment criteria are, what is involved in the formation and on-going revision of such conceptual maps of the university supervisor, and what is their function as a perceptual screen (for example, in informal conversation or in classroom observation) and as a professional development framework for viewing the progress of any particular student teacher during the quarter/semester experience.

The specific content of such supervisor knowledge and beliefs and their function--- albeit quite unconsciously in many cases---as a template or mental framework for evaluative judgments regarding student teacher performance seems both intriguing and crucial to better understanding the actual work of the university student teacher supervisor. According to both the research literature and an examination of current typical supervisory preparation and practice (4), this topic has been scarcely addressed until now.

ORIGIN & FOCUS OF THIS INVESTIGATION

In this case, the question was originally posed among a small group of experienced university student teacher supervisors and program coordinators in a

committee meeting at a large, midwestern university. They wondered aloud about the apparent paradox of feeling that the evaluative judgments they made during student teaching supervision were relatively clear-headed, systematic, and well grounded, and yet, on the other hand, knowing that each of them had different beliefs and thought and functioned as a supervisor in somewhat different ways. Moreover, they knew from past experience that it was difficult at times to find adequate words to describe what "occurred inside of their heads and hearts" as they went about their everyday supervisory activities and as they made evaluative judgments about specific student teachers.

Furthermore, they admitted to having some professional concern that what was a judgment of "great job!" by one supervisor could be regarded as merely "acceptable performance" for another supervisor. While these questions were not quite so troublesome in terms of the clinical instructor (i.e. formative evaluation) role of the student teacher supervisor, they became acutely problematic in their role of summative evaluator, particularly for judging a marginal student teacher as "passing" or "deferred grade--needs more time and effort to develop" or "failing." Out of these self-conscious insights and curiosity were born a reflective discussion group, a series of journaling and data collection activities by the supervisors themselves, and plans for a set of interrelated descriptive studies (5).

This article will report on an exploratory study using case study methodology to: (a) explore the professional backgrounds of three university supervisors and their beliefs concerning the purposes of the student teaching experience and of supervision; (b) identify the criteria which they have in their cognitive maps of effective student teacher performance; and (c) continue

developing and testing this research methodology for identifying, weighing, and analyzing these judgment criteria in a supervisor's cognitive map and their use in actual practice. A related paper comparing these criteria to each supervisor's actual classroom observation/conference notes and to the final reports written concerning a nominated sample of weak, average, and strong student teachers is in process.

This study seeks to apply methodological improvements derived from an earlier, descriptive study presented by two other members of the same research team and seeks to expand what is known in this area by adding three more case studies to the cases discussed in the earlier study. Both of these exploratory, descriptive investigations are part of a larger, long-range research project to identify such effective student teacher performance cognitive map criteria and to analyze them, their meaning, and their use in relation to each of the three role perspectives in the student teaching supervision triad. Eventually, this methodology has the potential to be useful in parallel studies of supervisors and experienced teachers and in studies of supervision in business and industrial settings also.

Thus, this effort to describe and better understand "what is" in typical university student teacher supervision practice today should provide a basis both for more focused, future studies and for raising questions regarding improved supervisory training and practice as a result. Taken as a whole, this set of studies emphasizes the importance of the university supervisor's implicit assumptions and cognitive processes---i.e. knowledge, thinking processes, and belief systems---in addition to the more typical focus on supervisory techniques if we are to better understand this key component of teacher education.

ALTERNATIVE VIEWS OF THE STUDENT TEACHING

EXPERIENCE & ITS SUPERVISION

A number of recent reviews concerning the goals, organizational structure, and actual operation of teacher preparation programs, particularly in terms of field experience and student teaching have been conducted. These include the overall survey of preservice teacher education by Joyce, Yarger, and Howey (6), surveys and analyses concerning early field experience (7), and reviews focusing both on field experience in general (8) and specifically on the student teaching experience (9).

> After reviewing such literature, Zeichner concludes:
> It is clear from any examination of the literature on field experiences that there is no agreed upon definition of the purposes and goals of either early field experience or student teaching and that there is a great deal of variety in the ways in which these experiences are conceptualized, organized, and actually implemented even within a single institution. (....) This discovery supports the general claim made by many researchers regarding the inappropriateness of deriving an understanding of an instructional program from statements of goals and instructional plans alone... and emphasizes the importance of examining how programs are actually implemented in the field. (10)

In his now classic 1983 article (11), Zeichner delineates five alternative models or paradigms of teacher education research and practice which can be used in this case to more closely examine the various goals, perspectives, and supervisory practices which can be found in the student teaching experience. The four approaches which Zeichner discusses are: (a) behavioristic, (b) personalistic, (c) traditional-craft, and (d) inquiry-oriented. A fifth approach, the academic paradigm, is also identifiable, but Zeichner chooses to regard its emphasis on a sound liberal education for teachers as a common assumption of the four other paradigms which he discusses.

The five alternative paradigms, Zeichner says, "can (each) be thought of as a matrix of beliefs and assumptions about the nature and purposes of schooling,

teaching, teachers and their education that gives shape to specific forms of practice in teacher education" (12). Thus, these paradigms can be useful in revealing alternative goal structures for the student teaching experience which are perhaps unstated or even unconsciously held, but which can function nevertheless as a basis for developing quite contrasting cognitive maps of successful student teacher performance. As Zeichner correctly points out, such paradigms are not totally distinct from each other in actual use, but rather, reflect relative shifts in emphasis placed on the prospective teacher's desired content knowledge, technical skills, and emotional and intellectual characteristics.

The behavioristic approach to teacher education is rooted in positivism and behavioristic psychology. It emphasizes the development and performance of the technical skills of classroom teaching which usually have been identified according to some research model of effective teaching and learning. The competency/performance-based teacher education movement of the past two decades is the most visible expression of this paradigm.

According to this view, then, criteria for successful student teacher performance would emphasize the observable demonstration of specific instructional skills without much simultaneous concern for the student teacher's underlying intellectual and emotional processes associated with demonstrating those behaviors.

The third major paradigm which Zeichner discusses is personalistic teacher education which is derived from phenomenology, humanism, and developmental psychology. Such programs "seek to promote the psychological maturity of prospective teachers and emphasize the reorganization of perceptions and beliefs over the mastery of specific behaviors, skills, and content knowledge" (13). This view emphasizes effective teaching as a matter of each person discovering her/his own style, purposes, and understanding.

With this approach, supervision can be seen as the need to provide a supportive, secure, facilitating environment in which individual goal clarification and risk-taking are possible. Evidence of a student teacher's success in such a program would be tied largely to external manifestations of internal cognitive, perceptual, and emotional growth related to gradually assuming the role of classroom teacher. Such evidence may be linked to a particular developmental model of so-called maturity in cognitive processes, teacher concerns, or emotional growth.

The traditional-craft or apprenticeship paradigm of teacher education is the fourth approach which Zeichner discusses. This view values the "wisdom of the practitioner" as a complex mixture of instructional skills and knowledge about effective teaching discovered through trial and error. Such "practitioner's wisdom" may indeed be tacit knowledge and not easily codified as specific program outcomes or evaluation criteria for use with prospective teachers.

The purpose of field experience according to this view is to provide conditions for the prospective teacher to study and practice in close proximity to more experienced teachers who can thus convey conventional wisdom and gradually guide the new teacher's attempts in becoming a successful teacher. Such an approach emphasizes "learning to fit" into established classroom practices, the teaching ranks, and schools as they "realistically" are. Thus, the loss of simplistic idealism about children and a recognition of the social context of education would be regarded as evidence of becoming "mature" in a professional sense. Moving thorugh lessons efficiently, managing the classroom effectively, and complying with the typical paperwork demands placed on teachers would be other general indications of becoming satisfactorily prepared as a beginning teacher.

With the exception of scattered innovations, the apprenticeship model of student teaching is the predominate one found today in the United States . This is

supported by both the nature of conventional teacher tasks which student teachers are reported carrying out and by the respective role assignments and contrasting levels of interaction occurring between the university supervisor and the student teacher (lesser) and between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher (greater).

Inquiry-oriented teacher education is the fifth paradigm which Zeichner discusses. Such an approach emphasizes "that technical skill in teaching is to be highly valued not as an end in itself, but as a means for bringing about desired ends. Questions about what ought to be done take on primary importance and the process of critical inquiry is viewed as a necessary supplement to the ability to carry out the tasks themselves". This view "requires that prospective teachers render as problematic that which is frequently taken for granted about the role of teacher, the tasks of teaching, and schooling in general" (14).

Thus, in addition to giving attention to development of the technical skills of effective teaching, content mastery, and the prospective teacher's own interests, such a teacher education program would teach and assess the student teacher's inquiry skills and corresponding reflective, analytical abilities and habits.

Zeichner's five paradigms, then, provide contrasting vantage points for determining what a university supervisor would expect of a so-called "successful" student teacher (15). In any given case, of course, the criteria actually used by a supervisor are drawn in an eclectic fashion from all the paradigms but with varying degrees of emphasis placed on each viewpoint.

WHO ARE UNIVERSITY STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS AND WHAT DO THEY TYPICALLY DO?

Unfortunately, there is more literature available concerning the perspectives, roles, and practices of both student teachers and classroom

cooperating teachers than of university supervisors. In addition, many of the early studies are now somewhat dated and often did not distinguish between university supervisors of early field experiences and those working with student teachers.

In their 1977 survey of preservice teacher education in the United States, Joyce, Yarger, and Howey provide information concerning the professional backgrounds and load assignments of a national sample of teacher educators (420 faculty members from a stratified random sample of nearly 175 universities and colleges). They report that 90% of such faculty members had public school teaching and administration experience with an average of eight years and two years longevity respectively. More than half (54%) reported that they were involved in supervision of student teachers. Much of their other information concerning student teacher supervision was obtained from department chairpersons and is summarized by them in this fashion:

> The average college supervisor is responsible for about sixteen student teachers (15.72) each quarter or semester, but this ratio varies widely depending on: (1) whether the supervisor is full or part-time, and (2) whether the supervision of student teachers is assigned to persons having only this responsibility or to regular full-time faculty members. Stratum (i.e. size of the teacher preparation program) is not an important variable with respect to the number of student teachers assigned to a supervisor.
> The average supervisor, according to department heads, observes and counsels with each student six or seven times (6.5) during a quarter or semester term. The supervisor spends about two hours (1.9) with the student on each visit. In summary, each student teacher receives an average of 12 hours of supervision from the college. (16)

The second major national survey available in the literature regarding university student teacher supervisors was reported by Bowman in 1978 in which he obtained information from 94 (or 88.7%) directors of student teaching programs operated in the 109 state colleges and land grant colleges in the United States. A summary of his study reports that "overall, the permanent faculty plus doctoral students was the most commonly used staffing pattern for

supervision, and was reported by 38 (40.4 percent) of the 94 schools" (17). Bowman also reports that 31.5% of the responding schools used subject area specialists, 12% used generalist supervisors, and 56.5% used combinations of these to supervise their student teachers.

In addition, the self-report data from the program directors indicated that 87% of their institutions had minimum observation visit policies which ranged from a low of one to a high of thirty with an overall average of four to five visits which averaged 90 minutes in length. This variation did not appear to correspond to differences in program size according to Bowman's analysis.

Perhaps the most interesting data in this study have to do with institutional reports concerning efforts to ensure competency in their student teacher supervisors. This is an almost unaddressed topic in the literature. Bowman reports: "Teacher preparation institutions have often been accused (by their own students as well as by public school personnel) of showing a lack of concern for the competency of the supervisor of student teaching. This criticism appears partly justified. One-third of the schools in this study seem to assume the competency of this person in the student teaching triad." He concludes: "Taken as an entire group, more schools reported 'teaching experience' than any other form of (more) formal effort to determine competency of the supervisor" (18). Because of the acknowledged lack of other pertinent literature on this topic (19), it is not known for sure how much (if at all) this view of the appropriate qualifications for university supervisors has changed since 1978, but we suspect that it has not.

Bowman summarizes the generally pessimistic meaning of this overall supervisory situation by saying:

> ...the foregoing gives little assurance that the supervision of student teachers holds a great priority among teacher preparation institutions.

> Supervision remains an inexact, vague, humanistic exercise in which the players vary greatly in backgrounds, philosophy, and objectives. Their procedures are inconsistent, often incompatible with any particular theory of learning or theory of supervision.
> (...)particularly disappointing is the number of officials who apparently believe that "teaching experience" or "academic degree" equals competent supervision. With the employment of such standards, the supervisory process will become not only an "exercise in futility" but also will create a negative image for the SCDE involved and for teacher education generally. (20)

An important, broader and equally valuable perspective can be obtained by examining the activities, beliefs, and backgrounds of teacher educators as a group and the environmental tensions which surround their work in universities. Lanier has reviewed the literature primarily in terms of the group of teacher educators who hold traditional positions in colleges and departments of education across the country and of their characteristics in relation to their other colleagues in academia.

The theme which emerges from her review is that this group is held in low esteem and relegated to the lower end of the academic stratification ladder by others in academia, possesses lower traditional scholarship commitments and interests, and de-values intellectual questioning and conceptual analysis. According to Lanier, among the major reasons for this is the fact that "A disproportionally large number of faculty teaching teachers most directly have come from lower middle class backgrounds. It is very likely that they obtain conformist orientations and utilitarian views of knowledge from their childhood experiences at home, educational opportunities in school, and restrictive conditions of work as teachers before coming to higher education." (21)

It is important to remember that in Joyce, Yarger, and Howey's 1977 national survey of teacher educators, slightly more than half of teacher education faculty were engaged in supervision of student teachers and that 90% had K-12 teaching and administrative experience. Bowman reported that having

teaching experience was the most commonly reported criteria for the selection of student teacher supervisors who were comprised of a mixture of regular faculty and graduate students. In their 1981 study, Griffin et al went one step further and concluded "Often, clinical supervision is an added responsibility to an already overburdened staff. As such, it is assigned to graduate students and assistants who must 'pay their dues'." The perceived nature of supervision is as "a low priority task with little benefit" in academia. They concluded that "the degree to which they function effectively as supervisors depends heavily on support, encouragement, and rewards available for that service" (22) but, such respect for student teacher supervision is currently difficult to find in the academic world.

Another key point related to the background knowledge and attitudes of university student teacher supervisors involves the distinction between the clinical generalist and the content area specialist approaches. As was indicated earlier in Bowman's 1978 survey, both approaches are used either separately or in combination (23). After reviewing the few comparative studies done on this point (24), McIntyre concluded that subject area specialists "often have little or no training in supervision" and are not usually viewed as being as skillful, knowledgeable, available, or concerned as clinical generalist supervisors by student teachers and cooperating teachers (25).

Such a situation undermines the development of both adequate supervisory practice and research in this country. While Lanier's historical analysis from the point of view of conventional academic respectability and rigor may be essentially correct, the influence of these factors can be subtle in shaping the professional knowledge and self-concept of student teacher supervisors themselves and the selection, preparation, and incentive structure for these supervisors in university teacher education departments.

In addition, the actual impact of the university student teacher supervisor has been broadly questioned from the perspectives of both those in academia and the school sites. McIntyre (26) provides a review of various studies indicating that the university supervisor may have either positive or little actual influence while Thies-Sprinthall (27) documents that a negative effect can occur. Thus, there is research evidence which coincides with our initial perceptions that the effectiveness of the student teaching experience can indeed vary with the individual characteristics of the persons involved and that there can be little (if any) conscious similarity among supervisors and between supervisors and the teacher education program in which they work.

As part of a recent set of comprehensive studies of clinical preservice teacher education done at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, O'Neal (28) focused on the perceptions and the feedback and evaluation practices used by nine university supervisors. After comparing the content of their supervisory conferences and final evaluation reports with university student teaching goal statements and evaluation criteria statements, O'Neal concluded that the former largely reflected individual supervisor's perceptions and concerns. In a related report, Edwards concluded:

> Satisfaction, fulfillment of expectations, and satisfactory performance evaluations of the student teacher should not be assumed to indicate that the experience resulted in professional growth and the acquisition of compentent teaching behaviors. (.....) Personal characteristics and the degree of match between perceptions and values of the members of the triad are highly predictive of the interactions and evaluations which take place in the clinical experience. (.....) Craft knowledge and 'common sense' are the basis of most decisions regarding specific clinical experiences. (29)

Thus, it is pertinent to question if a so-called circular problem regarding university student teacher supervision has not been unwittingly created over the years. The impact of seemingly weak job selection criteria used by universities for identifying student teacher supervisors and the apparent lack

of concern or agreement about how to prepare and reward supervisors in both the K-12 school and academic workplaces have been described here. Serious concern about the impact of these factors on both the instructional quality of the student teaching experience as well as on the validity and reliability of evaluative judgments made seems clearly warranted.

This leads us to wonder if Lortie's comments (30) about the negative consequences of a wide decision range for classroom teachers are not equally relevant and damaging in the case of university student teacher supervisors. Griffin et al (31) have referred to this as "selection by default" and link it to the unsupportive institutional context for supervision in university teacher education departments. If a job is perceived as requiring little or no particular focused training, and there are conflicting job demands and reward structures for it in both university and school settings, it is all too easy perhaps for teacher educators themselves to underestimate the complex knowledge, beliefs, and skills which are realistically involved in functioning as a supervisor in field experience settings.

Hence, our research efforts are directed at obtaining more adequate descriptive information regarding typical university student teacher supervisors' background, role perspectives, and evaluative judgment criteria as a basis for more focused, related studies and program planning.

PROFILES OF THE THREE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS STUDIED

In this case, three female university supervisors representing contrasting backgrounds were identified: (1) Renee, a novice supervisor (less than one year) with 11 years of elementary classroom teaching experience and a masters degree plus 30 credits in elementary education, (2) Fran, an experienced supervisor (five years) with 10 years of elementary and junior high

classroom teaching experience and ABD preparation in supervision and teacher preparation/staff development, and (3) Leslie, an experienced supervisor (three years) with 20 years of elementary classroom teaching experience and a doctorate in reading/language arts. All three supervisors are part-time student teacher supervisors. For Renee, this is a part-time job. Fran is a doctoral student employed on a half-time basis to coordinate the overall program in which she and Renee both supervise student teachers. Leslie is a full-time associate professor who coordinates her institution's student teaching program, supervises, and also teaches reading/language arts methods courses. This range of professional backgrounds appears to be quite congruent with conventional practice concerning the selection, training, and previous experience of typical student teacher supervisors today.

The data were collected from January - June 1986. Each supervisor participated in four individual cognitive mapping and interview data collection appointments of approximately 30 - 60 minutes each at the beginning, middle, end and after the end of the student teaching quarter/semester. The three distinct data collection points were used to explore if there were any developmental changes in the judgment criteria identified for different points of the student teaching quarter/semester. In addition, each supervisor was asked to make available the written supervisory records for a pair of so-calledweak, average, and strong student teachers (a total of six) with whom she was working at that time.

As with any case study investigation using self-reported data, caution must be expressed about the generalizability of these findings and the "social desirability" factor in the interview answers given. The researcher took the following steps to minimize these limitations: (1) developed a relaxed, collegial interview climate; (2) stated the research purpose which emphasized

the non-judgmental description of current supervisory beliefs and practices; (3) communicated genuine respect for the complex job of serving as a university supervisor; (4) gave specific attention to discussing both positive and negative factors as "normal" in any job setting; and (5) provided typical assurances of confidentiality to research subjects and their institutions.

Information regarding each supervisor's professional background, supervisory goals, knowledge, and beliefs, learning style, and level of cognitive development was also obtained through use of standard paper/pencil tests at the first appointment and through an interview during the final appointment. These were chosen based on a review of the literature which suggested that these areas could influence the process and outcomes of student teacher supervision itself. Such an amalgum of qualitative and quantitative data collection provides a rich and extensive data base for this and subsequent data analyses regarding the cognitive maps and role perspectives of university student teacher supervisors.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS

REGARDING SUPERVISORY ROLE PERSPECTIVES

Each supervisor's role perspective was investigated through interview questions which focused on elements of job qualifications and satisfaction, professional development needs, role definition, goals for the student teaching experience, supervisory beliefs and typical practices. Each of these interviews was tape recorded and later transcribed for comparative analysis.

When asked about the positive and negative aspects of being a student teacher supervisor, Renee and Fran both reported that they greatly enjoyed their work because it involved them in people's growth, participation in K - 12 school activities which they fondly remembered from their own classroom teacher

days, communication with many different types of people, and as a part-time job, left them time for personal and family activities. Leslie spoke of the stimulation provided by temporarily leaving "the Ivory Tower" of the college atmosphere and participating again with younsters in K - 12 schools, her satisfaction with student teachers' growth, and the inspiration with which many cooperating teachers provide her regarding the future of education.

All of these reported positive aspects of their work (see TABLE 1) focus on what could be called practitioner, action-oriented dimensions related to people's growth, communication, and interaction on a day-by-day basis. These answers are strikingly similar to Lortie's 1975 findings (32) regarding the reasons given by classroom teachers for being attracted to their occupational choice. Lieberman and Miller (33) refer to such practitioner interests and cognitive orientation as belonging to the world of action as opposed to the world of explicit theories and ideas. Along with lacking clear, immediate evidence of one's effectiveness, such occupations necessarily press one to act and to believe in the intentions of one's instructional actions, rather than to stand back and question in a detached manner as in the world of research. It is striking also that these supervisors' role perspectives (with the exception of Leslie) do not seem to include any view of themselves as working to reform or change current schools or teaching practices. The implication of this is to suggest that these supervisors would be very comfortable with the apprenticeship paradigm for the student teaching experience and for their roles in it.

As one would predict from the literature, Fran and Renee would like to continue on in their jobs while Leslie, the reading/language arts specialist, would like to continue supervising some student teachers but give up her program management component, and thus, have more time to teach methods and

foundations courses. Interestingly, Renee who is the novice supervisor and not involved in program management did not identify any negative features of her job thus far. The reported negative aspects of student teacher supervision for Fran and Leslie involved time management conflicts, lack of expressed institutional support, the paperwork and phone calls necessary for making student teacher placements, and the occasional need to make negative evaluation judgments about student teachers who do not perceive their own difficulties themselves. These features (see TABLE 1) may be characterized as related to the supervisor's workplace conditions and to program management and student evaluation responsibilities. These negative aspects can conversely also be seen as things which are barriers to the positive, people's growth and interaction activities which all three supervisors reported enjoying. Here is an empirical basis, then, for speculating about the impact of mild to moderate dissatisfaction with institutional support, workplace conditions, and evaluation responsibilities on the supervisor's own actions, job commitment, and self-concept and the resulting impact of this on the quality of student teacher supervision.

Each supervisor was also asked about her own professional development needs and what recurring issues or questions she had concerning the role of a university student teacher supervisor. This was an effort to ascertain their ability to self-evaluate and to determine the types of practitioner and/or theoretical issues about which they thought. These answers can also be used to suggest areas to be considered when preparing and supporting supervisors.

For Renee, as a new, part-time supervisor, her concerns clearly focused on personal and pragmatic uncertainities---e.g. about not knowing and not correctly following university policies, her own job security, and wanting to know more clearly when she had done a "good" job as a supervisor. Such task

and self concerns and the external need for information, feedback, and reassurance are predictable in someone who is a novice in any job position and suggest ideas for the initial training and support of new supervisors. This finding closely resembles the distinctions made among self-task-impact stages of teacher development by Frances Fuller (34).

Fran identified several specific areas of practitioner-oriented needs related to her own growth in effectiveness as a supervisor---e.g. how to conduct better seminars, professionalizing her own educational language more, knowing more about adult and staff development, learning more about how teachers learn---and also spoke of her concerns related to improved program management. As a supervisor with five years of experience and the only one with actual graduate preparation related to supervision, Fran's answers may be characterized as primarily task and impact-oriented with some very modest elements of theory-related curiosity.

Leslie's reported concerns range from the personal to the pragmatic to the political---e.g. career counseling skills, greater self-confidence and skill in negative evaluation situations, increased knowledge of various supervisory techniques, curiosity about adult learning and individual differences, and serious questions regarding her own role and that of education in social justice issues. In contrast to Renee and Fran, Leslie's mental life as a supervisor would seem to have both an ethical, abstract thrust as well as pragmatic and personal dimensions. In Fuller's terms, we find Leslie's concerns for self, task, and impact as a supervisor.

With only three case studies to consider here, it is difficult to say if Leslie (and to some lesser extent, Fran) is a counter-example of Lanier's (35) assertion that the professional background and the job assignment of typical teacher education faculty lead them to de-value intellectual questioning or

not. Despite her lack of any formal training in supervision, Leslie's questions may develop naturally out of her individual personal characterisitics such as cognitive style and complexity and her own wide-range of interests. However, her habit of seeking out things to read related to supervision and her eager participation in a local student teacher supervisor network group suggest that it is possible to develop and sustain such intellectual curiosity (even when one's initial training as a supervisor is lacking) if professional resources related to supervision are made available and questioning is encouraged. Whether it is due to the lack of readily available resources and/or to her own lack of developmental "readiness" to address impact concerns apart from a strong focus on self, this is not the case with Renee by contrast.

There is not other research literature which describes the self-perceived needs and concerns of student teacher supervisors, so knowledge concerning the origin and function of these factors for selecting supervisors and for providing both initial and on-going preparation for them is lacking at this time. However, we have a basis here for identifying some important questions to guide further exploration of this topic in the future. These questions would include: Does a supervisor' stage of self-task-impact developmental concerns influence her/his alertness and responsiveness to student teachers' own needs and concerns? How? What are the advantages and disadvantages of a supervisor's strong practitioner-orientation and seemingly close and uncritical stance toward current school practices? What differences exist in the knowledge base actually used by supervisors with and without supervisory training? How does the current predominately technique-oriented type of supervisory training help or hinder the development of a more theoretical and a reflective perspective in supervisors? How does this interact with the current predominance of the apprenticeship paradigm for student teaching programs in this country?

Analysis of the interviews and each supervisor's reported evaluation criteria and weights reveals that all three supervisors hold a view of the student teaching experience and their role as supervisors (see TABLE 1) which is congruent with Zeichner's (36) apprenticeship paradigm. That is, the purpose is, in Fran's words, to "give a student teacher a taste, as real a taste as possible, of what a real teaching situation is over time" . However, while Fran focused more on the instructional value of this for the student teacher as a basis for her/his own professional growth and career goal clarification, Leslie emphasized more of an evaluative focus, i.e., "the purpose is...to find out whether, when thrown into the deep end of the pool, one sinks or swims" . Renee's comments seemed to intertwine these two perspectives as inseparable.

Each supervisor was also asked about her views of the Clinical Instructor role and the Evaluator role in supervision and of the relative emphasis she placed on each in her work across the unfolding timeline of the quarter/semester student teaching experience (see TABLE 1). Each person's answer was consistent with the purposes which she saw for the student teaching experience described above.

Fran seems to separate these two roles in her work according to the changing time frame of the quarter/semester. She reported that she derives more satisfaction and gave more importance and time throughout the experience to the Clinical Instructor role, both in terms of classroom observation/conferencing and in the weekly group seminars. Depending on the topic, she does this in either a non-directive manner (40.2%) or a directive style (33.5%) in terms of Glickman's (37) distinctions in supervisory beliefs and style (see TABLE 1). Fran sees her Instructional role now as very parallel to her previous work as an elementary/junior high classroom teacher---"it gives

me the chance to help someone develop from point A to point K or M or whatever. Once that's over, and the evaluation part takes over at the end of the quarter, that working, that manipulation if you will, that's over, and I can't do anything more. So, I simply have to make a judgment on what I've done already." At the same time, Fran acknowledged that the Evaluation role, which she somewhat disliked, is a necessary part of the job and stated that she believes that even a negative evaluation is for "the student's benefit. I hurt when I have to be negative, but I think I would hurt much more if I were positive when I should have been negative."

Renee's views would seem to be mid-way between Fran and Leslie's. She stated that the Clinical Instructor role and the Evaluator roles are intertwined for her---"When you are critiquing, at the same time, you should be teaching...One can't be without the other". Renee's supervisory style is split evenly (40.2%) between non-directive and collaborative styles (38). The Evaluator role is one she accepts very comfortably as part of the job, and her view of evalutive feedback to student teachers emphasizes its instructional value for them as well as her own responsibility as evaluator---"As an evaluator, I've always tried to make it on a very personal, one-to-one level. If anything, it's very much 'constructive criticism'. I want it to be something they can learn from. I'm trying very hard not to hurt feelings, but at the same time, always being very truthful with them. So, the evalution part is very important, and it's learning how to handle each person."

For Leslie, the university supervisor is more primarily cast in the Evaluator role, with the cooperating teacher seen more as the Clinical Instructor for the student teacher, due to the typical time sampling schedule of the supervisor's observation visits to the school. In her own words:

> ...what I'm there to do is to evaluate the person's progress along the way at four or five different, specific points in time. (....) It really comes down to a gut feeling which is terribly subjective in one sense, but

> putting together everything I know about what does make a successful teacher, looking at that person operating in the classroom and seeing if I see that there. A lot of it is that person's eye contact, their voice quality, their ability to get the attention of the students, their interaction with the students...it's in the air between the student teacher and the students in the classroom. If it's there, I know it's there, and if it's not there, it's evident. But, it's never quite that simple...

At the same time, she believes that her Clinical Instructor role is further "dependent on the receptivity of the student teacher to my instruction or authority. (....) I can diagnose and offer suggestions, and whether or not they follow up on them, in a sense, I don't know because I don't stick around forever (to see)." Such a view corresponds closely to her predominately (53.6%) non-directive supervisory style and beliefs (39) and to a stated emphasis on helping her student teachers to think as a result of her evaluative feedback.

When she does not know the content area being taught, Leslie reports that she must critique in terms of generic aspects of teaching or take on the perspective of a pupil sitting in that student teacher's classroom. In her own words, she is "confident" in that role, even if student teachers offer "defensive statements" or "do not agree or follow up" on her suggestions because "I still think they go away and think about it, and maybe later on, they'll change or try it".

Such language seems to indicate that conferences are primarily viewed by Leslie as a time for communicating her evaluative judgments to the student teacher. She follows a developmental shift in supervisory roles across the length of the quarter/semester experience as Fran and Renee do, but Leslie places sharper emphasis on the Evaluator role much earlier---"I really stop doing any kind of clinical stuff at the halfway point, if not before, except in a sense, if people still need that and look for that, then they're in trouble (of not doing well) in my estimation". When such evaluations are negative, this experience can be "extremely difficult and painful" for Leslie.

Leslie's use of the term "suggestions" for her evaluative feedback, her own pre-dominately non-directive supervisory style, and her acknowledgment of the early shift from a Clinical Instructor role to an Evaluator role during the experience are striking in comparison with Fran and Renee. Important sub-questions to investigate further here would include: Is there a loss of the student teacher's "opportunity to learn" if the supervisor is too Evaluation role oriented early in the experience? How do the supervisor's own feelings about the Evaluation role, and particularly negative evaluation judgments, possibly undermine suitably rigorous evaluation of student teachers? How does a supervisor's preference for either the Clinical Instructor role or the Evaluative role and her/his supervisor style influence interaction between members of the student teaching triad? Much remains to be investigated in this area in the future.

While it seems possible to conclude that Leslie is somewhat less direct and confident of her evaluative feedback given to student teachers than Renee or Fran, it is difficult to determine in this preliminary study if this difference is primarily due to lack of supervisory training and experience (compared to Fran) or if there are alternative explanations which underscore the actual complexity of supervisory evaluative judgments and practices (compared to Renee). This can be cast as a variation on the famous "nature versus nurture" argument regarding the value of supervisory training. It could be that, despite her lack of training in supervision, Leslie is simply more conscious and articulate about the complexities of supervisor perception, learning to teach, and her own respect for the need of each student teacher to gradually develop a personal teaching style. These differences can also be due to characteristics of the supervisor herself such as perceived self-efficacy, supervisory goals, cognitive complexity and style. At the same time, we

recognize that supervisory training and experience can provide an avenue for modifying such lack of clarity regarding evaluative judgments and lack of confidence regarding one's role as a supervisor.

In a 1986 study which underscores the importance of these questions, Desrochers (40) reported that teachers' perceptions of supervisor knowledge, usefulness, and style were all highly correlated. How do such student teacher perceptions of the usefulness of the supervisor's clinical instruction and evaluative judgments undermine the quality of the student teaching experience itself? These questions will continue to receive attention in the future analyses of these data by the research team.

Thus, these initial data analyses would seem to indicate that differences in supervisory role perspectives and styles do, indeed, exist, even in this limited sample of only three student teacher supervisors with contrasting backgrounds. What remains to be explored now is: what differences (if any) do these make in supervisory judgments and practice? The second focus of this study involved identifying the evaluation judgment criteria of three supervisors.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS REGARDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA

The second focus of this study involved identifying the evaluative judgment criteria of the three supervisors. The three supervisors in this study were able to identify and weigh the criteria they believe that they use in making evaluative judgments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience and were able to organize their criteria statements into a horizontal and vertical cognitive map matrix without much difficulty.

Each of the university supervisors of student teachers was asked to identify the criteria she used in making supervisory judgments at three points of the student teaching experience: beginning, middle, and end. The criteria were recorded in the supervisor's own words using words or phrases which clearly expressed separate statements of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, habits, etc., which the supervisor would look for as appropriate evidence of how a student teacher is functioning in his/her placement situation. Such evidence could be gathered in any of the typical supervisory interaction situations--e.g., conversations, seminar discussions, classroom teaching observations, review of written materials prepared by the student teacher, comments from the cooperating teacher or principal, etc. It was pointed out that all such evidence-producing situations are relevant information-gathering opportunities for the supervisor who, in turn, processes this information in order to make judgments or decisions about the relative success or difficulty which a student teacher is having.

In addition to identifying these criteria, each supervisor was asked to indicate the relative importance of each criteria statement in her total, overall judgment about the student teacher's performance at that point in the experience by recording a number from 1 - 100 in front of each statement. The total of the point values or weights allocated among all the criteria statements had to total 100 points each time.

At the second and third data collection appointments, each supervisor was also shown her previous lists of criteria statements and their relative weights and asked if she would like to revise the material in any way. This part of the data collection effort occurred after she had already indicated (without any review) the criteria she used at that particular point of the student teaching experience. In this way, the criteria obtained at each data collection appointment were not biased or influenced by what was said previously, and yet,

there was an on-going reliability and validity check of the emerging cognitive map criteria statements and weights.

At the final appointment, each supervisor was asked to organize her three sets of criteria statements into an overall cognitive map containing both a vertical and horizontal matrix format showing any developmental changes from the beginning/middle/end of the experience (horizonal rows) and the conceptual subgroupings of similar criteria (vertical columns) which existed in the supervisor's mind. She was also asked if any she wanted to reverse, add, or subtract any criteria statements.

Thus, in terms of the research team's interest in pilot-testing this data gathering methodology here, it would seem to be both practical and reliable in this initial attempt. Reliability was tested using a test-retest approach in which supervisors were asked to examine their earlier criteria statement lists and to make any changes that they wished. Although each supervisor slowly re-read her previous list(s), no changes were ever made by any of the three supervisors. Plans to further investigate the validity of these cognitive map data are now underway using comparisons of the statements with actual final reports and observation notes made by each supervisor. (41)

In terms of the supervisors' self-reported judgment criteria, the project data suggest a refinement of Zeichner's (42) explanation of the apprenticeship paradigm. Both the specific criteria statements and the subgroup category names (see TABLE 2) identified by the three supervisors indicate their belief that learning to fit as a classroom teacher into schools today involves the adequate demonstration of three dimensions: (1) both liberal arts and content area knowledge (the academic paradigm); (2) suitable instructional skills (the behavioristic paradigm); and (3) professional attitudes and identity related to maturity and career commitment (the personalistic paradigm). Except for Leslie's

mild comment that she wanted to make student teachers think about her evaluative feedback, no evidence was found in either the interviews or their criteria statements of the inquiry-oriented paradigm.

Thus, from the perspectives of these supervisors and the rather conventional student teaching programs in which they worked, it seems possible to conclude that the apprenticeship paradigm can be used as a larger conceptual framework encompassing the other three paradigms and that it stands in sharp contrast to the investigation and change-oriented focus of the inquiry paradigm. This conclusion is also consistent with what was said earlier about the classroom teacher, practitioner, action-oriented background and role perspectives of these three supervisors, and indeed, of most current classroom teachers (43) and many teacher educators today (44).

This would suggest that if the inquiry paradigm for student teaching programs is ever to be genuinely used and if supervision is to develop into a field of more substantial research and a respected role in academia, it would appear necessary to either select or train supervisors in terms of this inquiry, critical thinking, and more theoretical orientation. However, at the same time, by deduction, these data also suggest that, according to the perspectives of these actual supervisors and the typical job activities they carried out, that the supervisor's practitioner-ability to knowledgably assess, to skillfully instruct, and to articulately discuss a student teacher's growth in each of these areas would also seem to be important in both the selection and training of student teacher supervisors. Such people need to be, in Lieberman and Miller's words (45), <u>bilingual and bicultural</u>, functioning effectively in both the worlds of research and practice.

There were interesting variations among the three supervisors in terms of idea complexity and fluency, two dimensions by which cognitive maps are routinely

analyzed (see TABLE 3). Three factors---the amount of supervisory experience, the degree of involvement in program operation and management, and a more general construct that could be called cognitive complexity---seem useful in understanding these preliminary data from the three case studies.

Renee, the part-time, novice supervisor, used the least amount of time to identify her criteria, stated them in the fewest words, and distinguished only minimally among them in terms of their relative weights. Fran and Leslie used longer periods of time to think about the task, were more detailed in their explanations of each criteria statement, and distinguished more sharply among the various criteria in terms of their weights. Leslie is notable for identifying more than twice as many criteria statements as Fran and for organizing her criteria into the largest number of subgroups in her final overall cognitive map. Possible differences in cognitive complexity as well as Leslie's role as overall coordinator of her institution's student teaching program and the fact that all of the faculty in their small department have taught and regularly discuss each student's progress throughout the preparation program may result in her being more articulate and able to make detailed distinctions than Fran who only deals with her student teachers for one quarter and who has no regular means of communication with their other instructors in such a larger teacher preparation institution.

Further, more detailed analyses of these supervisors' conceptual maps is planned by the research team. However, an initial assessment here supports a developmental view of student teacher growth in that the judgment criteria which these supervisors report using do change in their relative weights across the quarter/semester experience from beginning to middle to end (see TABLE 2). That is, there are different things that these supervisors report looking for at each time point in the experience, and which, having noted them, then fade into the

background or diminish in importance in their ever-evolving, overall, evaluative judgment. Those patterns are particularly strongest in Fran and Leslie's data who are the two supervisors with the greatest amount of experience and advanced training.

Without going into the detailed comparisons of each criteria statement which are planned for future analyses, it is also possible to readily note that there are fairly sizable differences among these three supervisors in the relative value they attach to the larger categories of criteria statements. As an example, the most easily recognized category of CONTENT KNOWLEDGE & CLASSROOM TEACHING SKILLS ranges in importance from 35% (Leslie) to 45% (Fran) to 53% (Renee) in their overall evaluative judgments. Such a preliminary finding coincides with the researchers' own supervisory experiences and early research hunches that there are important differences in supervisors' beliefs and evaluation criteria.

CONCLUSIONS & FURTHER QUESTIONS

This study has sought to better understand the "what is" situation of evaluative judgments and processes of university supervisors by exploring the role perspectives, goals, and evaluative judgment criteria held by three typical student teacher supervisors with contrasting professional backgrounds. The three case study subjects were chosen in an effort to investigate typical supervisors and practices in rather conventional student teaching programs in this country. Such descriptive research and the analyses which can follow are important in relation to considering how supervisory practices can be improved and what further research is necessary.

The data obtained in this study permit us to conclude several things. First of all, the research data in these three cases support the many informed opinions

and the scant research we have on the problematic state of university student teacher supervision at this time. On one hand, universities have seemingly weak job selection criteria, support systems, and reward structures for supervisors. At the same time, additional problems exist in terms of the reliability and validity of student teacher evalution judgments. In addition, supervisors themselves often lack a specific knowledge base related to their responsibilities and much metacognitive, reflective awareness of their own judgment criteria and processes (46).

Secondly, the data permit us to understand several points more deeply than such "conventional wisdom" about supervision has previously allowed. Three points will be addressed here as examples.

A contradictory tension exists between the current practitioner-oriented backgrounds and role perspectives of typical university supervisors and the inquiry-oriented paradigm for student teaching programs. While supervisors seem readily able to recognize (even without special training) the important role of liberal arts and content knowledge (i.e. academic paradigm), technical skills (i.e. behavioristic paradigm), individual maturity (i.e. personalistic paradigm), and occupational socialization (i.e. appenticeship paradigm) in preparing beginning teachers, they do not so readily include reflective, analytical, and change-seeking criteria in their cognitive maps of effective teaching. This would seem to have implications both for how they view their own roles as supervisors and well as what they expect from student teachers. Thus, conventional university supervision itself can be viewed as a key part of the conservative bias against change and reform in the educational field and personnel of which Lortie (47) writes. In this way, the context and barriers to efforts to reform university supervision and teaching itself have been better illuminated. While these discussions about professionalizing teaching have been

occurring widely during the past decade, these issues have not yet been raised in the field of supervision.

Responses to such critical analysis have included calls for increases in inservice education opportunities (48) and for the certification of teacher educators (49) and for changes in the traditional role definitions of university supervisors to something more like clinical professors (50). The functions of such clinical professors would include instructing and monitoring preservice students, working with inservice teachers and administrators, and using the schools as laboratories for research into educational practice.

However, preparation for such a broader role implies more substantial professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to effective teaching, teacher development, research methodology, and the operation of schools as complex organizations, communication, motivation, and evaluation than are now emphasized as qualifications for supervisors. Such a broader role description emphasizes what some have called the subtle, ambiguous, multidimensional nature of work which is concerned with theory and practice relationships with teachers in clinical settings.

We can also ask how certain characteristics of the university supervisor---e.g. perceptual biases, judgment criteria, cognitive complexity, job experience, stage of developmental concerns about his/her responsibilities, the Clinical Instructor/Evaluator role balance, self-efficacy beliefs, etc.---actually function unknowingly to diminish a student teacher's opportunity to learn. Figure 1 is a summary of our Supervisory Judgment Project research team's current thinking regarding a model of the factors influencing the supervisor's evaluative judgment criteria and processes. Again, while "conventional wisdom" has long recognized that there are so-called "good" and "not so good" supervisors available, we now know more about these specific factors and can begin to analyze their influence.

In addition, the benefits of supervisory networking, throughtful job-related discussions, and self-directed professional development have received emphasis here. While this seems obvious to any educator, the truth of the matter is that such professional development opportunities related to supervision are rarely available or used. The need to cultivate awareness, motivation, and respect for the complexities of effective supervision is striking both in supervisors themselves and in their university workplaces.

Interestingly, each supervisor reported that participating in the research project had stimulated her to a level of much greater self-awareness concerning the complexity, criteria, and processes of her evaluative judgments. Without exception, they said they had not thought deeply or frequently about these things before. There would seem to be some indirect professional development impact caused by such efforts to reflect on one's own supervisory judgment criteria and role perspectives. Such activities to develop self-knowledge do not appear to be widely used in the scarce and more technique-oriented supervisory training materials and programs which exist around the country. This area deserves further attention.

Finally, the research methodology developed for this study---i.e. a combination of interview and cognitive mapping techniques.---has proved to be both practical and reliable. A related study (51) focusing on the discriminatory function and the validity of the cognitive map data in comparison to each supervisor's written records for a nominated sample of so-called weak, average, and strong student teachers is now underway. The use of this methodology to explore the persistent problems of reliability and validity in teacher evaluation would seem to be promising.

In conclusion, little attention has been given yet to supervisory training or research based on the increasing knowledge we have about effective

teaching/learning/schooling and about professional decision-making in the past 10 - 15 years. This historical emphasis we have had on supervisory technique needs to be joined with attention to the knowledge base and cognitive processes used in the evaluative judgments which are at the heart of both the clinical instruction (i.e. formative) and the summative evaluation occurring in supervision.

The position of university student teacher supervisor is both a persistent and numerous one in its various forms in the education professoriate. It would also seem to be one which is relatively unexplored and casually regarded. This series of studies are being undertaken to describe the role perspectives and evaluative judgment criteria of such supervisors in order to reveal the largely unrecognized, complex mental life and the practices of student teacher supervisors. This should provide a basis for improving the selection, training, and rewarding of supervisors and for deepening and expanding research on supervision.

REFERENCE NOTES

1 - By the term "university" student teacher supervisor, we include those who supervise student teachers on either a full-time or part-time basis for colleges and universities. By using this phrase for conciseness, we are not limiting ourselves to those employed by universities only.

2 - Christopher M. Clark and Penelope L. Peterson, "Teachers' Thought Processes" in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. M.C. Wittrock (3rd edition) (New York: Macmillan, 1986), pp. 255-296; Hugh Munby, "The Place of Teachers' Beliefs in Research on Teaching and Decision-making and on Alternative Methodology" (Report No. 9042. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982); Richard J. Shavelson and Paula Stern, "Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgments, Decisions, and Behavior," Review of Educational Research, 51 (Winter 1981), pp. 455-498; Robert J. Yinger and Christopher M. Clark, "Self-reports of Teacher Judgment" (Research Series No. 134. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 495, 1983).

3 - Donald A. Schon, The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

4 - Gary A. Griffin, "Supervision and Evaluation in Student Teaching, Induction, and Inservice" (Report No. 9054. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1984); Gene E. Hall, "Clinical Supervision in Teacher Education as a Research Topic," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (July-August 1983), pp. 56-58; D. John McIntyre, "A Response to the Critics of Field Experience Supervision," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (May-June 1984), pp. 42-45; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Education," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 44-52.

5 - The Supervisory Judgment Forum group began to meet in the fall of 1983 and included three experienced student teacher supervisors (Drs. Arden Moon, Roger Niemeyer, and Joanne Simmons), the overall department chairperson who had responsibility for administering five alternative student teaching programs (Dr. Henrietta Barnes), and a cognitive psychologist with experience in research on decision-making (Dr. Chris Clark).
The subsequent, multi-stage research project has been designed by Simmons, Moon, and Niemeyer to extend their original dual roles as researchers and as research subjects in the Forum group to now include other sets of student teacher supervisors as research subjects. The purpose of this is to produce further descriptive data and to continue to develop these methodological approaches for studying supervisors' cognitive maps of effective teacher performance and their use in the complex process of clinical instruction and evaluation of student teachers.
See also: Roger C. Niemeyer and R. Arden Moon, "Researching Decision-making in the Supervision of Student Teachers: A Study of Supervisory Judgments" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986); Joanne M. Simmons, R. Arden Moon, and Roger C. Niemeyer, "A Critique of Recent Methods & Variables Used to Research

the Thinking & Evaluative Decision-making of Instructional Supervisors" (paper accepted for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987); Joanne M. Simmons, "'Wha'd She Think?'---A Comparison of the Evaluative Judgment Criteria and Written Records of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors" (in process).

6 - Bruce Joyce, Sam J. Yarger, and Kenneth R. Howey, Preservice Teacher Education (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Center for Educational Research, 1977).

7 - Jane H. Applegate, "Early Field Experiences: Recurring Dilemmas," Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (March-April 1985), pp. 60-64; Jon J. Denton, "Do Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education Provide a Meaningful Context for Acquiring Pedagogical Knowledge?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1985); Peggy Ishler and Richard S. Kay, "A Survey of Institutional Practice" in Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, ed. Clark Webb, Nathalie Geherke, Peggy Ishler, and Alicia Mendoza (Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980), pp. 15-22; Mark R. Malone,, "Preservice Field Experience in Teacher Education: A Qualitative Synthesis" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985); Charles Moore, "National Survey Queries Early Field Experiences" Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) Newsletter, 13 (November/December 1979), p. 3.

8 - D. John McIntyre, Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse for Teacher Education, 1983); James F. Nolan, "Professional Laboratory Experiences: The Missing Link in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 33, (July-August 1982), pp. 49-53; Thomas F. Ryan, "Field Experiences in Teacher Education" in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Harold Mitzel (5th ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1982), pp. 682-686; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Myths and Realities: Field-based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (November-December 1980), pp. 45-55; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 44-52.

9 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981); Richard H. Hersh, Ray Hull, and Mary S. Leighton, "Student Teaching" in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Harold Mitzel (5th ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1982), pp. 1812-1822.

10 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 45, 48.

11 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (May-June 1983), pp. 3-9.

12 - Ibid, p. 3.

13 - Ibid, p. 4.

14 - Ibid, p. 6.

15 - For a parallel discussion, see also: Nancy L. Zimpher and Kenneth R. Howey, "Alternative Purposes of Teacher Education: Implications for Supervisory Practice" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986). Zimpher and Howey refer to four major purposes or domains of teacher education: (1) technical competence; (2) clinical competence; (3) personalized competence; and (4) critical competence.

16 - Bruce Joyce, Sam J. Yarger, and Kenneth R. Howey, Preservice Teacher Education (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Center for Educational Research, 1977), pp. 99-100.

17 - Novy Bowman, "Student Teacher Supervision, Practices, and Policies," Action in Teacher Education, 1 (Summer 1978), pp. 62-65.

18 - Ibid, p. 64.

19 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981).

20 - Novy Bowman, "Student Teacher Supervision, Practices, and Policies," Action in Teacher Education, 1, (Summer 1978), pp. 64-65.

21 - Judith E. Lanier, "Research on Teacher Education" (Occasional Paper No. 80. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 450, 1986), p. 29.

22 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981), p. 37.

23 - When the university supervisor is a clinical generalist, the classroom cooperating teacher is usually viewed as taking the role of the content area specialist.

24 - Kent Freeland, "Assessing Student Teaching," Teacher Educator, 15 (Autumn 1979), pp. 11-16; Douglas L. Herbster, "Generalists vs. Specialists in the Supervision of Student Teachers," Teacher Educator, 11 (Winter 1975-76), pp. 32-34; Nancy L. Quisenberry, James D. Quisenberry, and Margo Willis, "An Evaluation of the Southern Illinois University - Carbondale Center Approach to Professional Education Experiences" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, February 1978).

25 - D. John McIntyre, Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1983), p. 13.

26 - Ibid; D. John McIntyre, "A Response to the Critics of Field Experience Supervision," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (May-June 1984), pp. 42-45.

27 - Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "Supervision: An Educative or Mis-educative Process?," Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (July-August 1980), pp. 17-20.

28 - Sharon F. O'Neal, "Supervision of Student Teachers: Feedback and Evaluation" (Report No. 9047. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 106, 1983).

29 - Sara A. Edwards, "Clinical Perservice Activities: Education, Development, Training---Three Case Studies" (Report No. 9023. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 240 099, 1982), p. 88.

30 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

31 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Maria E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981).

32 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

33 - Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

34 - Frances Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," American Educational Research Journal, 6 (March 1969), pp. 207-226; Joanne M. Simmons and Gloria M. Dennen, "Implications of Developmental Concerns Theory for the Student Teaching Experience," Michigan Association of Teacher Educators (MATE) Viewpoints, 5 (Spring 1983), pp. 12-17.

35 - Judith E. Lanier, "Research on Teacher Education" (Occasional Paper No. 80. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 450, 1986).

36 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (May-June 1983), pp. 3-9.

37 - Carl D. Glickman, Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers Improve Instruction (Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981).

38 - Ibid.

39 - Ibid.

40 - Cynthia G. Desrochers, "Relationships Between Supervisory Directness and Justification in the Teacher-Supervisor Conference and Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisory Credibility," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986).

41 - Joanne M. Simmons, "'Wha'd She Think?'---A Comparison of the Evaluative Judgment Criteria and Written Records of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors" (in process).

42 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (May-June 1983), pp. 3-9.

43 - Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

44 - Judith E. Lanier, "Research on Teacher Education," (Occasional Paper No. 80. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 450, 1986).

45 - Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

46 - For a discussion of the important role of reflection in supervision, see: Noreen B. Garman, "Clinical Supervision: Quackery or Remedy for Professional Development?", Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1 (Winter 1986), pp. 148-157; Noreen B. Garman, "Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision: A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (Fall 1986), pp. 1-24; Lee A. Turner-Muecke, Tom Russell, and Jane Bowyer, "Reflection-in-Action: Case Study of a Clinical Supervisor," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (Fall 1986), pp. 40-49.

47 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociologial Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

48 - Gary Rush and Judy Wood, "In-service Education of Teacher Educators: A National Survey," Action in Teacher Education, 4 (Fall 1982), pp. 71-73.

49 - Doyle Watts, "Teacher Educators Should Be Certified," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (January-February 1984), pp. 30-33.

50 - Nancy Bredemeier, Richard Kindswatter, and William W. Wilen, "A Conceptualization of the Clinical Professorship" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 532, February 1975); James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963); Allen R. Warner, James M. Cooper, and W. Robert Houston, "Rethinking the Clinical Concept in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (January-February 1977), pp. 15-18.

51 - Joanne M. Simmons, "'Wha'd She Think?'---A Comparison of the Evaluative Judgment Criteria and Written Records of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors" (in process).

TABLE 1: ROLE PERSPECTIVE OF THREE STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS

	Fran	Renee	Leslie
BASIS OF JOB SATISFACTION	-involvement in K-12 setting & people's growth -human interaction -part-time job time compatibility	-involvement in K-12 setting people's growth -human interaction -part-time job time compatibility	-involvement in K-12 setting people's growth -inspiration from "good" teachers
BASIS OF JOB DISSATISFACTION	-time management conflicts -lack of institutional support -paperwork -stress of making negative eval. judg. of s.t.	-none	-time management conflicts -lack of institu tional support -paperwork -stress of making negative eval. judg. of s.t.
OWN PROFESSIONAL DEV. CONCERNS (Fuller, 1969)	-supervisory tasks -program management	-personal -supervisory tasks	-personal -supervisory tasks -impact
PARADIGM FOR VIEWING S.T. EXPERIENCE	-apprenticeship	-apprenticeship	-apprenticeship
SUPERVISOR'S PREDOMINATE ROLE	-clinical instructor	-inseparable	-evaluator
RELATIVE SHIFT BETWEEN SUPERVISOR'S ROLES OVER THE TIME PERIOD OF S.T. EXPERIENCE	CI/e	CI/e	ci/E
SUPERVISORY BELIEFS/STYLE (Glickman, 1981)			
- directive	33.5%	20.0%	13.4%
- collaborative	26.8%	40.2%	40.2%
- non-directive	40.2%	40.2%	53.6%

TABLE 2: CATAGORIES OF EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA IDENTIFIED BY THREE STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS (using their own words)

	beginning	middle	end	total	%	ranking
Renee						
-personality & attitude	43	41	24	108	36.0	2nd
-subject knowledge & management skills	49	50	59	158	52.7	1st
-communication	8	9	17	34	11.3	3rd
TOTALS	100	100	100	300	100.0	
Fran						
-prof. commitment	45	0	0	45	15.0	4th
-prof. skills	25	50	60	135	45.0	1st
-human relations skills	15	25	25	65	21.7	2nd
-prof. socialization	15	25	15	55	18.3	3rd
TOTALS	100	100	100	300	100.0	
Leslie						
-teaching process skills	11	23	35	69	23.0	1st
-content/cognitive skills	23	2	12	37	12.3	5th
-personal maturity	20	32	15	67	22.3	2nd
-prof. growth	17	20	26	63	21.0	4th
-interpersonal relationship skills	29	23	12	64	21.3	3rd
TOTALS	100	100	100	300	99.9	

Table 3: FLUENCY & COMPLEXITY DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA COGNITIVE MAPS OF THREE STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS

	Fran	Renee	Leslie
# OF CRITERIA STATEMENTS IDENTIFIED (beginning; middle; end of the experience)	7;8;8	12;12;12	16;20;13
TOTAL # OF CRITERIA STATEMENTS IDENTIFIED	23	36	49
TOTAL # OF WORDS USED IN CRITERIA STATEMENTS	226	122	546
MEAN # OF WORDS USED IN CRITERIA STATEMENTS	9.8	3.4	11.1
RANGE IN POINT VALUES USED IN WEIGHTING CRITERIA STATEMENTS	5 - 40	7 - 9	2 - 10
# OF MINUTES USED TO IDENTIFY CRITERIA STATEMENTS (beginning; middle; end of experience)	15;12;20	10;10;10	18;20;15
# OF SUB-GROUPINGS MADE FOR CRITERIA STATEMENTS	4	3	5

Figure 1: A MODEL OF FACTORS INFLUENCING SUPERVISORY EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA AND PROCESSES

THE SUPERVISOR---as influenced by training and experience

KNOWLEDGE-BASE

- effictive teaching/learning/schooling
- teacher education/staff development
- supervision

ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

- goals of teaching/learning/schooling
- goals of student teaching experience
- own supervisory role perceptives
- own supervisory job satisfaction
- own supervisory developmental stages of concern (a la Fuller)
- own supervisory style (Glickman)
- own supervisory self-efficacy beliefs (a la Guskey)

DATA COLLECTION AND COGNITIVE PROCESSING

- perceptual alertness
- perceptual comprehensiveness
- perceptual biases
- critical thinking skills & habits
  practitioner vs. theoretical orientation (Lieberman & Miller)
- cognitive style
- cognitive complexity (Hunt)
- awareness of own metacognition processes
- awareness of own attitudes and beliefs
- awareness of others

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

1/86

IDENTIFYING CRITERIA FIELD SUPERVISORS USE IN MAKING JUDGMENTS ABOUT STUDENT TEACHERS

You are cordially invited to participate in a professional development and research project experience that will help to reveal and clarify your thinking processes as you make decisions about your student teachers.

The research project objectives are:
(1) to identify the criteria which field supervisors have in their cognitive map of "effective student teaching performance" and which they use in the decision-making process to judge relative success or difficulty of student teachers, and
(2) to develop and test a research methodology for identifying and analyzing these criteria and cognitive maps.

This research project is based on previous investigation including field work journals kept by three MSU student teacher supervisors, a forum on supervision which included these field supervisors and two other researchers from the Department of Teacher Education and from the Institute for Research on Teaching at MSU, and periodic individual debriefing sessions with these two outside researchers. This has been an on-going project since 1984.

Data collection procedures College/university supervisors of student teachers will be asked to identify the criteria they use in making supervisory judgments at three points of the student teaching experience: beginning, middle, and end. The supervisors will participate in four data collection appointments of approximately one half hour each at the beginning, middle, end, and after the end of the student teaching experience. The criteria will be recorded using words or phrases which clearly express separate statements of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, habits, etc. which the supervisor looks for as appropriate evidence of how a student teacher is functioning in his/her placement situation. This evidence may be gathered in any of the typical supervisory interaction situations---e.g. conversations, seminar discussions, classroom teaching observations, review of written materials prepared by the student teacher, comments from the cooperating teacher or principal, etc. All such evidence-producing situations are relevant information-gathering opportunities for the supervisor who, in turn, processes this information in order to make judgments or decisions about the relative success or difficulty which a student teacher is having.

In addition to identifying these criteria, each supervisor will be asked to indicate the relative importance of each criteria statement in his/her total, overall judgment about the student teacher's performance at that point in the term/semester by recording a number from 1 - 100 in front of each statement. The total of the points allocated among all the criteria statements should total 100 points each time.

At the last three of the four data collection appointments, each supervisor will be shown a summary "cognitive map" listing of the criteria and their relative weights identified in his/her earlier appointments and then asked if he/she would like to revise the material in any way. This part of the data collection effort will occur after he/she has already indicated (without any review) the criteria used at that particular point of the student teaching experience. In this way, the criteria obtained at the beginning of each data collection appointment will not be biased or influenced by what was said previously, and yet, there will be an on-going reliability and validity check of the emerging cognitive map criteria statements and weights.

Information regarding each supervisor's professional background, supervisory knowledge and beliefs, learning style, and level of cognitive development will also be obtained. The identity of each supervisor will be kept confidential.

RESPONSE SHEET FOR SUPERVISORY JUDGMENT CRITERIA RESEARCH PROJECT

Your name_____Institution _____

Today's date_____ Circle one: early mid-term end final summary

Please list below the criteria you are using as you interact with your student teachers and make judgments about their relative success or difficulty at this point in the term.

These may be knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, habits, etc. which you look for as appropriate evidence of how a student teacher is functioning in his/her placement situation.

Use as many words or phrases as you need to express each criteria clearly below. You may use as much time as you need to record your statements below. After you have finished, please indicate the relative importance of each criteria by recording a number from 1 to 100 which would reflect the relative importance of each item in your total, overall judgment about a student teacher. You have a total of 100 points to distribute among your various criteria statements.

____ points 1.

____ points 2.

____ points 3.

____ points 4.

____ points 5.

____ points 6.

____ points 7.

____ points 8.

____ points 9.

____ points 10.

____ points 11.

____ points 12.

--------turn page over if you wish-------

J.M. Simmons 1/87

DIRECTIONS FOR SORTING, CLUSTERING, & NAMING THE CRITERIA STATEMENTS DURING THE FINAL DATA COLLECTION APPOINTMENT

Each one of the evaluative judgment criteria statements which you identified in our previous appointments at the beginning (B), middle (M), and end (E) points of the supervisory time frame has been retyped on these pieces of paper and then cut apart. Notice that each statement has been labeled with a B, M, or E and clipped together and that the point value or relative weight that you indicated for each criteria statement has also been included.

Step 1: Lay out all your criteria statements on this large piece of paper under the headings of B, M, and E in such a way that simultaneously shows:

(1) how similar criteria statements across the B, M, and E time points could be lined up in horizontal rows under the B, M, and E; and

(2) how families of related criteria could be subgrouped in the vertical columns under B, M, and E.

If this task seems too difficult to do, please just say so, and you do not have to proceed. If you find there are some of your criteria statements which don't fit into a horizontal row or vertical column subgrouping, please just lay them aside in a separate grouping.

Step 2: When you are satisfied with the overall configuration, tape or glue the pieces of paper with your criteria statements and weights to the larger sheet of paper in the horizontal and vertical pattern you have created.

Step 3: As you look at the total picture in front of you, are there any new criteria statements under the B, M, or E vertical columns or in any of the horizontal row category subgroupings that you would want to add now? If so, please write it on the large sheet of paper in the proper horizontal and vertical position and draw a box around the statement so that it fits in with your other criteria statements.

Step 4: Identify a category name for each horizontal row subgrouping that would adequately describe the items you have clustered together as related to each other. (e.g. CITRUS FRUITS would describe a grouping of oranges, lemons, limes, grapefruits, etc.)

S.T. Supervisory Judgment Criteria Project 4/86 J.M. Simmons

DIRECTIONS FOR SORTING & CATEGORIZING CRITERIA STATEMENTS IN FINAL INTERVIEW

Each one of the S.T. evaluative judgment criteria which you identified in our previous appointments at the beginning (B), middle (M), and end (E) points of the S.T. term/semester experience have been retyped on these pieces of paper. Notice that each one has been labeled with a B, M, or E and clipped together and the point value or relative weight that you indicated has also been included.

I. Could you now lay out all your criteria statements on this large piece of paper under the headings of B, M, and E in such a way that shows (1) how similar criteria statements could be lined up in horizontal rows under B, M, and E and (2) how families of related criteria could be subgrouped in the vertical columns under either B,M, or E? If this task seems too difficult to do or you find there are some criteria statements which don't fit into a subgroup with others, please just say so.

II. As you look at the total picture in front of you, are there any new criteria statements under the B, M, or E critical columns or under any of your horizontal category subgroupings that you would want to add now? If so, please write them on a blank piece of paper and be sure to adjust the point values under B, M, or E as necessary.

III. Try to put a category name on each subgroup that would adequately describe it for you.

QUESTIONS FOR FINAL INTERVIEWS

(answers to be tape recorded--use probing questions as appropriate)

Cognitive Map of Evaluative Judgment Criteria

1 - How satisfied are you now with this as an adequate representation of your cognitive map of specific S.T. evaluative judgment criteria? If not, please explain what you feel is missing yet?

Experience & Job Satisfaction as a S.T. supervisor

2 - How many years have you supervised S.T.?

3 - Approximately how many S.T. do you supervise each term/semester?

4 - In what ways (if any) do you enjoy your work as a S.T. supervisor?

5 - In what ways (if any) do you not enjoy your work as a S.T. supervisor?

6 - In an overall way, how satisfied are you with working as a S.T. supervisor compared to other job assignments that you could have?

7 - How important, etc. do you feel that your college/university employer views effective S.T. supervision to be?

Role Perspectives, & Procedures Used

Goals as a S.T. Supervisor

8 - Describe what you believe are the purposes of the S.T. experience.

9A - Describe what you hope a S.T. would gain from having you as a university supervisor.

9B - Do you feel that your answer to question 9A is very unique or rather similar to other university S.T. supervisors?

10 - Two different ways of viewing your work as a university student teacher supervisor involve your (a) evaluative role, and (b) your clinical instructor role.

10A - How would you describe your evaluative role? How do you carry that role out? How do you feel about that role?

10B - How would you describe your clinical instructor role? How do you carry that role out? How do you feel about that role?

10C - What kind of a balance or relative emphasis do you place on each of these roles in your work as a university student teacher supervisor?

11 - If you went to work for a different university as a S.T. supervisor, do you think that you would alter your evaluation criteria for judging S.T. performance at all? If so, how would you change them?

12 - Describe the type of S.T. that the teacher preparation program at your university seeks to produce.

S.T. Program Operation & Data-gathering Opportunities

13 - What is the nature and types of contacts you have with the S.T. you supervise?

13A - Initial Introductions:
- -When and how do you first meet your S.T. supervisees?
- -What do you seek to find out about a S.T. supervisee at this time?

13B - Classroom Observations
- -Are you required to make a minimum number of classroom observations? If yes, how many?
- -What type of observation notes form do you use? Please provide a sample copy.
- -What percent of the time do you conference with S.T. after making a classroom observation? What do you seek to find out in such a conference?
- -What percent of the time do you conference with the cooperating teacher when making a classroom observation? What do you seek to find out about your S.T. in such a conference?
- -What percent of the time do you conference with a building or department administrator when making a classroom observation? What do you seek to find out about your S.T. in such a conference?

13C - S.T. Seminars
- -Do you require S.T. to attend regularly scheduled group seminars?
- -Please attach a copy of the seminar titles/topics.
- -What kind of interaction do you have with your S.T. at these seminars?
- -What do you seek to find out about your S.T. at such seminars?

13D - S.T. Journals and Other Written Work
-Do you require S.T. to complete journals? If yes, are these journals personal/private or interactive?
-What do you seek to find out about your S.T. from such a journal?
-What other types of written work do you require your S.T. to complete?
-What do you seek to find out about your S.T. from such written materials?

13E - Social Interactions
-What type (if any) of planned social interactions do you have with your S.T.?
-What do you seek to find out about your S.T. at such social interactions?

13F -Are there any other ways in which you gather data about your S.T. which are important to your evaluative judgments about that S.T.?
-What do you seek to find out about your S.T. from each additional data source?

Evaluative Judgments Made as a S.T. Supervisor

14 - Is it more true to say that you feel generally accurate and certain of your initial judgments concerning a student teacher or that you are frequently revising your initial judgments as the term/semester unfolds? Please explain the reasons for your answer.

15 - Do you have any experiences of "changing your initial judgment" about a particular student teacher? If so, please describe a couple of cases. How does this mind-changing process occur?

Qualifications of University S.T. Supervisors

16 - What would you say are your qualifications to be a university S.T. supervisor?

17 - If you had a chance to hire university S.T. supervisors for your university's teacher preparation program, what qualifications, ideally speaking, would you look for?

18 - What previous training (if any) through courses, workshops, conferences, independent reading, etc. would you say you have had related to your work as a S.T. supervisor?

19 - During the past year, in what professional development activities (if any) related to S.T. supervision such as courses, workshops, conferences, independent reading, etc. have you participated?

Future Plans & Professional Development

20 - In what areas (if any) would you like to improve as a S.T. supervisor?

21 - How interested are you in continuing on in your present role as a university S.T. supervisor in the years ahead?

22 - What reoccurring issues or questions (if any) do you have about your work and the role of university S.T. supervisor?

developmental Supervision : Alternative practices for helping teachers improve instruction — Carl D. Glickman. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981. pg 12-15.

The Supervisory Beliefs Inventory

This inventory is designed for supervisors to assess their own beliefs about teacher supervision and staff development.* The inventory assumes that supervisors believe and act according to all three of the orientations of supervision, yet one usually dominates. The inventory is designed to be self-administered and self-scored. The second part lists items for which supervisors must choose one of two options. A scoring key follows, which can be used to compare the predictions of Part I with the actual beliefs indicated by the forced-choice items of Part II.

Part I. Predictions *(Check one answer for each question.)*

Questions	Percent of Time				
	Nearly 100%	About 75%	About 50%	About 20%	About 0%
1. How often do you use a *directive approach* (rather than either of the other two approaches) in supervising teachers?	____	____	____	____	____
2. How often do you use a *collaborative approach* (rather than either of the other two approaches) in supervising teachers?	____	____	____	____	____
3. How often do you use a *nondirective approach* (rather than the other two approaches) in supervising teachers?	____	____	____	____	____

* This instrument has been field-tested six times with 90 supervisors and supervisor trainees. Responses between the options indicated "good" item discrimination. The items were also critiqued by teachers, curriculum specialists, and college professors in education for theoretical consistency. Dr. Roy T. Tamashiro of the Ohio State University developed this inventory with me.

Part II. Forced Choices

Instructions: Circle either A or B for each item. You may not completely agree with either choice, but choose the one that is closest to how you feel.

1. A. Supervisors should give teachers a large degree of autonomy and initiative within broadly defined limits.
   B. Supervisors should give teachers directions about methods that will help them improve their teaching.
2. A. It is important for teachers to set their own goals and objectives for professional growth.
   B. It is important for supervisors to help teachers reconcile their personalities and teaching styles with the philosophy and direction of the school.
3. A. Teachers are likely to feel uncomfortable and anxious if the objectives on which they will be evaluated are not clearly defined by the supervisor.
   B. Evaluations of teachers are meaningless if teachers are not able to define with their supervisors the objectives for evaluation.
4. A. An open, trusting, warm, and personal relationship with teachers is the most important ingredient in supervising teachers.
   B. A supervisor who is too intimate with teachers risks being less effective and less respected than a supervisor who keeps a certain degree of professional distance from teachers.
5. A. My role during supervisory conferences is to make the interaction positive, to share realistic information, and to help teachers plan their own solutions to problems.
   B. The methods and strategies I use with teachers in a conference are aimed at our reaching agreement over the needs for future improvement.
6. In the initial phase of working with a teacher:
   A. I develop objectives with each teacher that will help accomplish school goals.
   B. I try to identify the talents and goals of individual teachers so they can work on their own improvement.
7. When several teachers have a similar classroom problem, I prefer to:
   A. Have the teachers form an ad hoc group and help them work together to solve the problem.
   B. Help teachers on an individual basis find their strengths, abilities, and resources so that each one finds his or her own solution to the problem.
8. The most important clue that an inservice workshop is needed is when:
   A. The supervisor perceives that several teachers lack knowledge or skill in a specific area which is resulting in low morale, undue stress, and less effective teaching.
   B. Several teachers perceive the need to strengthen their abilities in the same instructional area.
9. A. The supervisory staff should decide the objectives of an inservice workshop since they have a broad perspective of the teachers' abilities and the school's needs.
   B. Teachers and the supervisory staff should reach consensus about the objectives of an inservice workshop before the workshop is held.

10. A. Teachers who feel they are growing personally will be more effective in the classroom than teachers who are not experiencing personal growth.
    B. The knowledge and ability of teaching strategies and methods that have been proven over the years should be taught and practiced by all teachers to be effective in their classrooms.
11. When I perceive that a teacher might be scolding a student unnecessarily:
    A. I explain, during a conference with the teacher, why the scolding was excessive.
    B. I ask the teacher about the incident, but do not interject my judgments.
12. A. One effective way to improve teacher performance is to formulate clear behavioral objectives and create meaningful incentives for achieving them.
    B. Behavioral objectives are rewarding and helpful to some teachers but stifling to others; also, some teachers benefit from behavioral objectives in some situations but not in others.
13. During a pre-observation conference:
    A. I suggest to the teacher what I could observe, but I let the teacher make the final decision about the objectives and methods of observation.
    B. The teacher and I mutually decide the objectives and methods of observation.
14. A. Improvement occurs very slowly if teachers are left on their own; but when a group of teachers works together on a specific problem, they learn rapidly and their morale remains high.
    B. Group activities may be enjoyable, but I find that individual, open discussion with a teacher about a problem and its possible solutions leads to more sustained results.
15. When an inservice or staff development workshop is scheduled:
    A. All teachers who participated in the decision to hold the workshop should be expected to attend it.
    B. Teachers, regardless of their role in forming a workshop, should be able to decide if the workshop is relevant to their personal or professional growth and, if not, should not be expected to attend.

Scoring Key

Step 1. Circle your answer from Part II of the inventory in the columns below:

Column I	Column II	Column III
1B	1A	
	2B	2A
3A	3B	
4B		4A
	5B	5A
6A		6B
	7A	7B
8A		8B
9A	9B	

10B.....10A
11A.....11B
12A.....12B
13B.....13A
14B.....14A
15A.....15B

Step 2. Tally the number of circled items in each column and multiply by 6.7.

2.1 Total response in Column I _____ × 6.7 = _____
2.2 Total response in Column II _____ × 6.7 = _____
2.3 Total response in Column III _____ × 6.7 = _____

Step 3. Interpretation

The product you obtained in step 2.1 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a *directive approach* to supervision, rather than either of the other two approaches. The product you obtained in step 2.2 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a *collaborative approach*, and step 2.3 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a *nondirective approach*. The approach on which you spend the greatest percentage of time is the supervisory model that dominates your beliefs. If the percentage values are equal or close to equal, you take an eclectic approach.

You can also compare these results with your predictions in Part I.

What To Do With Your Score

You now have a base to look at the orientation with which you are most comfortable. If your scores for two or three orientations were about equal (30 percent nondirective, 40 percent collaborative, and 30 percent directive), you are either confused or more positively eclectic. If you are eclectic, you probably consider varying your supervisory orientations according to each situation. Practitioners of one orientation might become more effective by learning the very precise supervisory behaviors that are needed to make that orientation work. To think that supervision is collaborative is incomplete until one knows how to employ techniques that result in collaboration. Many supervisors profess to be of a certain orientation but unknowingly use behaviors that result in different outcomes. Therefore, *the first aim of this book is to help supervisors become proficient in practicing their beliefs about supervision. The second aim is to "elasticize" supervisors' practice so they can move knowingly across the*